

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/724,342	11/26/2003	Hosheng Tu	816020-100067US	816020-100067US 9989	
34026	7590 03/17/2005	-	EXAMINER		
JONES DA		MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H			
	FIFTH STREET, SUITE LES, CA 90013-1025	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		3738		
			DATE MAILED: 03/17/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No		Applicant(s)	<i>i</i> ,			
Office Action Summary		10/724,342		TU ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		William H. Matth	news (Howie)	3738				
Dania d S	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			orrespondence addi	ess			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, how oly within the statutory m will apply and will expire te, cause the application	vever, may a reply be tim inimum of thirty (30) day: SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
Status								
· · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from conside						
Applicat	ion Papers			,				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptains a constant and a const	cepted or b) ot e drawing(s) be hel ction is required if t	d in abeyance. Se he drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFF				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been rec nts have been rec ority documents h au (PCT Rule 17.	eived. eived in Applicati lave been receive 2(a)).	ion No ed in this National S	itage			
2) Noting Noting (3) Information	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	· _	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D Notice of Informal F Other:	(PTO-413) ate Patent Application (PTO-	152)			

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 is indefinite because of the limitations recited in lines 5-7. Specifically, "digging ht distal portion" in line 5 and the final sentence of claim 10 are unclear.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "said pulling mechanism" in line 1 and "said engaging element" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1,4,9-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,558. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims are broader, and therefore encompassed by the narrower, patented claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Block et al. US PN 5,554,185.

Block et al. discloses in figures 2 and 5 and lines 1-63 of col. 5 and lines 63 of col. 7 through line 50 of col. 8 a method of delivering a longitudinally collapsible prosthesis as claimed. The prosthesis disclosed is a stentless cardiac or venous valve which may also be defined as a valved conduit or biological vascular graft (e.g. a valve graft).

7. Claims 1-3,5,6,7,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens US PN 5,545,214.

Stevens discloses in figures 9-15 and lines 25-49 of col. 1 a method of delivering a longitudinally collapsible prosthesis as claimed. The prosthesis disclosed is a cardiac

Application/Control Number: 10/724,342 Page 4

Art Unit: 3738

or venous valve which may also be defined as a valved conduit or biological vascular graft (e.g. a valve graft).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hamblin, Jr. et al. US PN 6,197,054.

Block et al. meets the structural limitations of claim 7 as described above but lacks the express written disclosure of the coupling step comprising stapling. Hamblin, Jr. et al. teaches in lines 32-50 of col. 3 a method of coupling a valve to tissue comprising the step of stapling in order to firmly attach the valve to tissue.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method disclosed by Block et al. by using the step of stapling as taught by Hamblin, Jr. et al. in order to firmly attach the valve to tissue.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number

المترو

Application/Control Number: 10/724,342 Page 5

Art Unit: 3738

is 571-272-4753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WHM 3-15-05

> CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700